

# CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

"WERE ONCE THESE MAXIMS FIX'D—THAT GOD'S OUR FRIEND, VIRTUE OUR GOOD, AND HAPPINESS OUR END, HOW SOON MUST REASON O'ER THE WORLD PREVAIL, AND ERROR, FRAUD AND SUPERSTITION FAIL."

Vol. XIV.

Gardiner, Maine, Friday, August 15, 1834.

New Series, Vol. VIII.—No. 33.

PRINTED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING BY  
P. SHELTON,  
PROPRIETOR.

WILLIAM A. DREW, Editor.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum, payable in advance. If payment be delayed more than six months from the commencement of an annual subscription, two dollars and fifty cents will be considered the price and accordingly required.

Subscribers in all cases are considered as continuing their subscriptions unless all arrears are paid up and a discontinuance expressly ordered, and no papers will be discontinued (except at the discretion of the publisher) while any arrears remain unpaid.

All letters relating to the business concerns of the paper must be addressed to the Printer at Gardiner, and communications intended for publication should be addressed to the Editor at Augusta.

N. B. All letters to the Printer or Editor must be post paid.

Any person procuring six good subscribers and becoming responsible for them shall be entitled to a seventh copy, so long as the subscribers continue, and in like proportion for a smaller or larger number.

## UNIVERSALISM DISCUSSED.

From the Philadelphian of July, 31, 1834.

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 9.  
Philadelphia, July 25, 1834.

Dear Sir,—Several of the periodical papers of the Universalists have conjectured, very reasonably, that my deep concern in the ecclesiastical controversies now pending in the Presbyterian Church, has caused my delay in answering your two last letters, and in pursuing our amicable discussion. The newspapers published by your denomination of persons in the United States, seem to be almost exclusively devoted to one object,—that of convincing all men, that however they may live and die, they shall all infallibly be holy and happy in an immortal future state of being. Your example, in most of these publications, of sending forth weekly some sermon, with the proper name of the author attached to it, I deem worthy of imitation. Our newspapers take a more extensive scope and treat of every thing, by turns, in which our fellow men may be supposed to be interested. The *Philadelphian*, your are aware, is of this general character; while its peculiar bearing is on the ecclesiastical concerns of that Church of which the Editor is a minister. I cannot, therefore pursue any one subject of discussion to the exclusion of twenty other objects of attention. And yet, could I suppose any considerable number of Universalists likely to be convinced, by the plainest assurances of the word of God, of the truth that some shall be lost forever, and thereby induced to prepare to meet their God in peace, I should think myself happy in editing a paper for their sole benefit.

It has often occurred to me to ask, what profit can Mr. Thomas expect will be derived to any one from his doctrine, even if it is true? Men may be saved, and certainly will be saved, if his theory is correct, whatever may be their opinions about Universalism. Belief in his doctrine is not at all connected with salvation. It is not, therefore, as a means of salvation that he would write and preach on the doctrine of universal salvation. His gospel, if it is a gospel at all is not the power and wisdom of God unto salvation, for salvation would come to all men independently of any knowledge of this good news.

It has also occurred to me to inquire, if Mr. Thomas has ever known the preaching of the doctrine of universal salvation to be the means of reforming the moral conduct of any wicked man? I do not deny, that a Universalist may teach many of the truths of the Bible, and that they may be the means of amending the life; but did the proclamation, that all men, live and die as they may, shall infallibly be happy in heaven, ever bring any sinner to repentance; ever make any drunkard become a sober man; ever render any polluted mortal chaste; or ever incline a prayerless and graceless man to pray, and serve God in a spiritual manner? I do not affirm that this never was the case, but I ask for the candid testimony of a Universalist on this subject. A gospel which does not make a transgressor cease from doing evil and learn to do well is not profitable for the life which now is, even if it should show all to be safety in that which is to come.

I do not honestly apprehend, that Universalism is productive of any other benefit than that of quieting the consciences of the wicked, and filling them with hope of final safety, though they continue impudent in the practice of the worst crimes to which they are inclined. While there are allowedly respectable and moral people in the ranks of Universalists, I seriously ask you, Sir, if the mass of any Universalist congregation of your acquaintance can be declared equal in point of sobriety, industry, and good general moral character, to the mass of any congregation of equal numbers in which the doctrine of future punishment is inculcated?

But I am reminded, that the question is, what say the sacred Scriptures? Do they teach the future, everlasting punishment of some of the human family? or the future holiness and happiness of every individual? I have affirmed the former; you the latter. We have been running on collaterally, each in the citation of Scripture to prove his own proposition, and to disprove that of his opponent. I confess, freely, that my object has been,

and still will be, not so much to discuss passages critically, for the benefit of the learned, who may not thank us for our labor, as to present in a popular form such plain and scriptural arguments, citations and illustrations, as in my judgment ought to convince every unprejudiced reader of the Bible that some sinners will be miserable forever. If in some instances I have slid further into critical disquisition than I had originally intended, it has been with a desire to convince you, Sir, of the truth. Mainly I have written for the generality of our readers; I presume you have done the same: but at times the aspiration arises, *Oh that he were wise; that he understood these things; that he would consider his latter end!*

My opinion that a part of Matt. xxiv. refers to a future state is founded on the fact that the disciples asked two questions; 1st. What shall be the sign of thy coming? 2dly. What shall be the sign of the end of the world? and on the language of our Savior's answer. Had they not proposed an inquiry concerning the end of the world, as distinct from the time of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, we might not have looked for an answer. He told them of his coming in the last verse of the preceding chapter; and in the 2d verse of this chapter he assured them concerning the buildings of the temple, "there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." It was therefore very natural they should ask, *When shall these things be, that thou has predicted? What shall be the sign of thy coming, of which thou hast just spoken?* And, as they supposed the world was then to come to an end, *What shall be the sign of the end of the world?*

You agree with me, that from the 4th to the 35th verse Christ answers the question concerning his coming to the destruction of Jerusalem: concerning which he said, "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." By *generation* here you seem to understand the Jews then living; and all of them did not pass before Jerusalem was destroyed. This, however, is not the exclusive sense of a *generation*, in the Bible, for all the Jews, from the beginning to the end of the world constitute one generation of men; and all lying and wicked men belong to one generation of vipers. You affirm that the latter part of the 24th chapter from the 36th verse to the end refers also to the same coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. I think it refers to a future coming of Christ, because it is an evident answer to the last question which his disciples had asked, and because by the disjunctive conjunction he turns from the time of which he had been speaking, and says, "But, of that day and hour knoweth no man." He then proceeds to say, that "as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." He shall come on mankind suddenly, when they do not expect him; and shall sweep multitudes away, dividing some from others. He does not say, that all these things, spoken after the 35th verse, but all those spoken of before it, shall take place, "before this generation pass." Because Christ shall come unexpectedly to the final judgment, he commands all his disciples, saying, "Therefore, be ye also ready for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh." "Then," when the son of man shall come as the flood in the days of Noah, "shall two be in one field; the one shall be taken and the other left;" or separation shall be made even between persons engaged in the same field of labor; and then shall the lord of the unfaithful servant "cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." "Then," also, says Christ in the next chapter, "shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins," five of whom were foolish, had no oil in their vessels, were unprepared for the coming of the bridegroom, "and the door was shut." Afterward they came crying, "Lord, Lord, open to us: but he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know ye not. Watch, therefore, and pray, for ye know neither the day nor the hour, wherein the Son of man cometh."

How can they be saved who are not prepared to meet Christ at his last coming to our world, and whom he will not acknowledge?

"For he is as a man travelling into a far country," says Christ of himself, Math. xxv. 14; for the kingdom of heaven, as I have before remarked, is erroneously supplied in Italian print by the translators "For he [the Son of Man] is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.—After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and reckoneth with them." The Son of Man reckoned with them, that who has gone away into heaven, and who has entrusted us with all the different talents we possess, will act in like manner; will come to judge all his subjects. "Then," to wit, in the end of the world, "he that had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee, that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed, &c. His Lord answered and said

unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant," and finally gave commandment, "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Pursuing the same theme and still answering the question concerning the signs of the end of world, the Redeemer says, in simple verity, without a parable, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." It has never been shown by yourself, or any one, that this which you call a parable of the sheep and goats, to whose separation at night allusion is made, has reference to events which have long since transpired. Why need I quote any more? To the end of the chapter Christ teaches in the clearest terms how he will act in the end of the world, when all nations shall be gathered before him. This is an event which has not yet arrived, and refers to a judgment yet to come on all mankind. If you assert, that the nations have ever yet all been gathered before the Son of Man, and divided according to their character, I ask you when? and where? It is not until we arrive at the first verse of the xxvi chapter, that we learn Jesus "had finished all these sayings," which he uttered, after coming out of the temple, being pointed to its massy stones, and having predicted its demolition.—From the 36th verse of the xxvth chapter to the end of the xxvth, Jesus discourses in reply to the last inquiry of his pupils. If you can make the declaration, "these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal" mean temporal judgments brought on the Jews, I must think your principles of interpretation wrong, because they render the Bible an uncertain, unmeaning rule of faith.

I do not admit that Christ ever acknowledged his inability to inform his disciples of the time when the end of the world shall be. Your favorite McKnight may show you that Christ said, *no man maketh known that day.* It was revealed to no mere man, and Christ did not see fit to make known the precise time "when he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." This second time of his appearing I may remark, when he shall come not as a sin-offering but as a judge, is to be after men have died, for "as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him will he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. ix. 27.—28.

Because Mark and Luke record one of the questions which the disciples asked Christ, it does not follow that Matthew was not correct in stating two or three. Several true witnesses may testify to several different circumstances, and all which they all attest is to be credited. In Luke xvii. 20—37, Christ discoursed about the destruction of Jerusalem in answer to the Pharisees, and used expressions very similar to those which he employed on another occasion, when his disciples asked about the end of the world. I do not admit, therefore, that Matt. xxiv. 36—41, and Luke xvii. 26—37, are parallel passages. This, however, is true, that the coming of Christ at the end of the world shall in many particulars be like his coming to judge Jerusalem in the time of her destruction by the Romans; and this has led many to conclude that Christ's prophecy concerning his coming must have a double meaning and a twofold accomplishment.

It is true, that to your arguments intended to prove, that the faithful and obedient have the whole of everlasting life in this world, I have failed to reply; for if you mean that to know God and Jesus Christ is everlasting life begun in the soul, I agree; but if you mean that everlasting life is not a benefit promised to all believers to be enjoyed forever and ever, after it is begun here, why it seems to me needless and trifling to undertake to show that everlasting life does mean everlasting life, and not merely the life which the good lived in this fleeting state.

You wish me to know, that the Almighty is to be regarded as *endless* in duration, not because some derivative of the Greek word *aion* (always being) is applied to him, but because we read of *aphthartos*, the *incorruptible* God. Rom. i. 23. You confess that *aionion* expresses an unlimited duration in 2 Cor. v. 1; but think that the terms used in 1 Peter i. 4, such as *aphthartos* incorruptible, and *amarantos*, unfading, and in Heb. vii. 16, *akatalutos*, endless, are much stronger.

The very passage you quote from Heb. vii. 16, if you add the next verse, will prove that this is a false pretense; for Jesus is said to be made a priest after the power of an *endless* life, (*zoen akataluton*) for this reason, that God had testified, thou art a priest forever, *eis ton aionon*.—Thus his *endless* life as a priest, resulted from his being made by divine appointment a priest for ever, *eis ton aionon*. A life, indissoluble, that is *akatalutos*, is the result of an *aionion* decree, or appointment.

*Aionios*, therefore, is stronger than *akatalutos*, according to the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is "because he continueth ever he hath an *unchangeable* priesthood." Heb. vii. 24.

You say, "I have shown that *aionion* is not unequivocal in its signification; and I will add, that your argument in proof of endless punishment will be essentially improved, if you can find the words *aphthartos*, *amarantos*, *akatalutos* or either of them applied to punishment in the Bible."

I reply, that *akatalutos* signifies *without dissolution*, or not to be dissolved, and *zoen akatalutos*, a life without dissolution is freely rendered *endless* in Heb. vii. 16, in opposition to one's death, or dissolution;—but the words employed to denote punishment could not without great incongruity, and confusion of metaphor, be coupled with these terms which you pronounce more unequivocal than *aionion*, *endless*. The sacred writers had too much good taste to write of *incorruptible* fire, *indissoluble* burnings, or *unfading* punishment. We may with good sense and taste speak of *endless* or *aionion* fire, burnings, punishment, death, and life; hence we read, Matt. xxv. 46, "these shall go away into *endless* punishment, *eis kolasin aionion*, but the righteous *eis zoen aionion* into *endless* life." The words *thanatos* death, *olethros* destruction, *pur* fire, *kolasin* punishment, *apoleias* perdition, *thlipsis* tribulation, *krisis* damnation, and the like, I repeat it, may well be qualified by *interminable*, *endless*, and *everlasting*; but it would be a violation of congruity to qualify them by *incorruptible*, *unfading*, and *indissoluble*; as much so as to speak of an *audible* sight, or of a *tangible* vision.—It is unreasonable therefore, to require that the doctrine of endless punishment shall be proved, if proved at all, by finding incongruous affinities, and violations of propriety in the sacred oracles. In connection with the fire of punishment threatened the term *unquenchable* is used, and has the same force as *indissoluble*, when connected with life; for a fire never quenched and a life never dissolved must each be *endless*. Moreover, in Mark ix. 43, and Matt. xviii. 8, to *pur to aionion* and to *pur to asoston* that is *aionion* or *everlasting* fire, and *unquenchable* fire are used as synonymous.

If my life is spared, it is my design to pay some attention to your last letter in my next.

Yours respectfully,  
EZRA STILES ELY.

From the Trumpet.

"THERE IS ONE GOD."

The evidence that supports the doctrine of the existence of an all-wise, all-powerful, infinitely good Being, who created and governs all things, is so palpable, that, in my opinion, any one who denies the existence of God, must be at least partially disordered in his understanding. Therefore, I do not write with the expectation of convincing such persons; but with the hope of leading the youthful mind into a proper train of thought, and to guard it against the sophistry which may attract its notice. The first, and principal evidence which I shall offer in support of the existence of Deity, is, the wonderful order and harmony which pervade the universe. We behold the sun, always keeping his proper place, without the least deviation, dispensing light and heat throughout the whole planetary system. We behold the planets, each in its proper orbit, revolving round the sun in its most perfect order and harmony. And these planets have their attendant satellites, continually revolving round their proper centres of attraction. We also behold the comets, which occasionally visit the planetary system, and although their various courses are extremely eccentric, passing across the orbits of the planets, yet all this takes place without the least jar or interference. But this planetary system, great and wonderful as it is, is but a small part of the universe. In a clear night we behold an infinite number of stars (and what there is beyond the reach of our vision none can tell); and these stars are fixed bodies like the sun, and resemble him in appearance. Therefore, we may rationally conclude, that each one of these stars is a sun, which forms the centre of a planetary system. And, it is not irrational to suppose that every planet is inhabited as well as the earth. What an Almighty power must that be, which created and governs such an immense number of worlds and systems of worlds!—What an immense subject of contemplation! Is there a God? The whole creation speaks, and with a voice that none but fools can mistake: saying, "verily, there is a God!"—The order and harmony which pervade the universe; the sun, which warms and enlightens the whole planetary system; the rain which falls upon the earth; the vegetation, that springs up out of the earth, for the use of all creatures; the air, the water, and all that is in them; the beasts, reptiles, and insects; even every creature that flies in the air, walks on the earth or swims in the water; each being particularly calculated to support and enjoy life; all, unite their testimony, and prove there is a God: and that his goodness is universal.

That there is but one Supreme Being, is evident from the nature of things. The order, harmony and union of purpose, which is manifest throughout the universe, is undoubtedly, the production of an undivided, Almighty Mind. But the Atheists say, "all things by chance happened so to be, and cannot be otherwise." But, do order and harmony happen by chance? If a ship master should let his ship sail by chance, what would be the consequence? If a farmer, mechanic or merchant, should leave his business to the guidance of chance, what would be the consequence? If then, the common concerns of men require the exercise of human intelligence, to guide and direct them, how much more does the universe require supreme intelligence, to guide and direct its motions. Order and harmony never came by chance, but are always the effect of wisdom and intelligence. And, where there is no wisdom to plan, no intelligence to guide, there is always confusion. As man possesses the principle of intelligence sufficiently to enable him to accomplish great designs, so the cause which produced man, must possess supreme intelligence. If we should view a noble and beautiful edifice, and examine its nice proportions, its beautiful ornaments, and the curious arrangement of those ornaments, and should be filled with admiration by contemplating the whole structure, what would be the conclusion in our minds?—Should we conclude that all this was the effect of chance, that there was no wisdom to plan, no intelligence to guide and direct the building of the edifice? Or, should we not rather conclude, that it was the production of a great and wise Architect? And, if we admire the building, should we not also honor the builder? As the Architect must possess a powerful mind, while the edifice is a mere senseless thing; so, the cause which produced all things, is greater, and more powerful than the universe itself. Now let us contemplate a ship, which is the noblest production of human effort. We know, that all the materials of which the ship is composed, are natural productions; wrought and prepared by human exertion. We know that the wisdom and intelligence of man, did contrive, the power of man did build, and the genius and taste of man did beautify and adorn her. Now, behold her! completely equipped and manned for a voyage. See her, spreading her sails so as to make the winds of heaven subservient to her use. See her, gliding away across a trackless ocean; guided by the genius of man, and the luminaries of heaven, to her port of destination. See her return, loaded with the fruits and merchandise of other climes. The ship is the means of communication between distant nations. She helps men to obtain, and to communicate knowledge and information. Did chance, ever do the like? If then, chance cannot build ships, and navigate them, how is it possible, that it should build worlds, and systems of worlds, and navigate them throughout boundless space, through eternal ages.

Here then, we have three important propositions established by natural evidence.

1st. That order, harmony and regularity, never came by chance, but are always the effect of wisdom and intelligence. Hence, the order, harmony, and regularity which pervade the universe, are proofs, that the cause which produced and governs all things, does possess infinite wisdom and intelligence.

2d. That cause is superior to effect. Hence, that cause which produced all things does possess infinite power.

3d. That man possesses the spirit of wisdom and intelligence in some degree. Hence, the spirit of man bears the resemblance, and is in some measure related to his Maker. Of course, we may rationally conclude, that man is destined to a more perfect, more holy, and consequently more happy state and condition than the present. But here, some one may observe, that the brutes possess all the faculties and capability necessary to their comfort and enjoyment, as well as man. But this only proves the wisdom and goodness of God. It does not prove that the brutes possess a rational spirit. The brutes do not improve their faculties by study, nor have we any evidence that they are capable of contemplating the Power that produced them; or any other subject. But it is not so with man. Man, in a state of infancy, is the most feeble, helpless creature on earth. But man is constituted to progress towards perfection. His mental faculties increase by exercise. He is capable of contemplating divine things, and the more he contemplates spiritual and divine subjects, the more wise, the more perfect, and the more happy he is. Hence, the goodness of God is most conspicuously manifested in the creation of man. And hence, the idea arises, that man is destined to immortality; which great change, must be effected by the mediatorial power of Jesus Christ.

How conspicuously does the goodness of God appear throughout all creation! Every creature is abundantly supplied with all its wants. Vegetation produces food for man and beast. Man needs the



labor of the brute, the brute needs the care of man; and by God's furnishing the brute with food, he bestows a blessing on man; for man's condition would be miserable indeed, without the benefits which he derives from the brute creation. But, it is impossible to particularize all the good things which we receive at the hand of God. "The whole earth is full of his goodness." "The firmament shows forth his handy work; day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge of him." "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust." Therefore as God is our Creator, and is thus universally good, it becomes our bounden duty to love, serve and obey Him; to worship and adore Him. And as God has set us an example, so let us be good unto all, and receive all men as brethren. And, may we look forward with joyful anticipation to the time, when we shall be perfect in love, "even as our Father in heaven is perfect." And may our joy be full, and our peace complete, through our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Amen. E. B.

# CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

—"And Truth diffuse her radiance from the Press."

GARDINER, AUGUST 15, 1834.

## RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE.

It is truly lamentable to see how little of honest principle there is in the religion, and in the religious attachments, of great numbers of professing christians. Take, for instance, the congregation of any popular sect, in any large town or city, and of the whole number that strut along to the house of worship, how many do you suppose are guided thither by honest principle?—how many enter that place, as worshippers, because, after a candid and thorough examination of the whole subject, they have become rationally and conscientiously convinced that the creed there adopted and taught is true? We would not wish to be censorious, or to enter rashly into judgment with other men. But we are permitted to judge others by their fruits; and in these, the fact is not to be disguised, these are evidences which none can resist if they would. There is too much reason to fear—nay, to believe—that with vast numbers, religion is as much an article of merchandise on the lists of fashion, as any other article of outside dress and display. Their whole behavior shows that this is the case with them. Now if this miserable policy was confined to the least influential and most disputable class of society, the evil would be less humiliating; but, unfortunately, so far as our observation extends, the evidences of such a policy are as much against those who claim to be, and who enjoy the reputation of being, the most pious and active christians—those who stand as the greater lights in the church, and as the honored exemplars to the more humble and unobtrusive professors—as against any others. We have sometimes, as we have witnessed the want of principle there is in the world—as we have seen how many are willing to sell their opinions and their liberty to the highest bidder—almost sickened on a review of "poor human nature," and been near subscribing to the autodox doctrine of "total depravity." We fear the number of honest men is smaller than it should be; and if Universalists would build up their Societies in numbers, we do think it is less important that they should labor to prove their doctrine true—for this will never convince certain minds—but that their chief effort should be to induce people to be honest and independent in their religious principles. Not one tenth part of the opposition which is exercised against Universalism, arises from the conviction that the doctrine is false. Whether true or erroneous, most of our opposers care little about questions of this kind; if it is unfashionable or unpopular, this circumstance is a sufficient reason with them why they should oppose it. We do hope, most fervently, that the doctrine of future and eternal hell torments is not true; for if it is, we do most seriously fear that the great body of those who are the greatest sticklers for this sentiment, will suffer its severest fires, as the reward of their insincerity, hypocrisy and persecuting disposition.

## OPPOSITION.

Though opposition, merely for the sake of opposition, is never to be commended, yet we should never allow ourselves to contract that mawkish sensibility which, for the sake of obtaining the reputation for being remarkably pacific, would induce us to look upon the prevalence of injurious errors with indifference, and without any effort to expose and check them. None can be more seriously convinced than we are, that simple opposition is not the principle upon which Societies should be erected. If this is all which induces effort, no society so constituted will long endure. Still, we live in a world, where "all nature's difference makes all nature's peace;" where some excitement is necessary and healthful, and where opposition to error and fraud is a positive duty. Our Savior when on earth, was prompt in his opposition—an open and

avowed opposition—to the errors and malpractices of the Scribes and Pharisees. And as our Master, we too must be prompt in exposing similar errors and misdeeds in our own times. Universalists look around them, and they find about every professedly christian sect opposed to them—and the opposition they receive is of a peculiarly unthankful character. There are none who fellowship us as christians; none who recognize our clergyman as ministers of the Gospel, or will extend to us the customary civilities which are connected with the religious profession. All are engaged in pouring upon us a continual fire of opposition—an opposition which shows itself not only in misrepresenting our doctrine, but also in traducing our characters, and in laboring to destroy even our social peace and happiness. We think we know of many persons, male and female, who are so exemplarily pious,—so signally religious,—that if they saw a Universalist family in distress, they would not offer to it the sympathies or the humanities of social life; but who would "pass by on the other side," in cold contempt and neglect. Such being our situation, and witnessing as we do witness, such monstrous errors afloat—errors dishonorable to God and injurious to human happiness, we are called upon by the imperious demands of duty to oppose those who are thus arrayed against the religion of Jesus and the believers in his Gospel. This opposition must, indeed, be seasoned with grace; still it must be carried on fearlessly and valiantly until the watchmen proclaim a complete and final victory in the name of the holy child Jesus.

## ANECDOTE.

We find the following anecdote in the Concord Star and Universalist, from the pen of Br. R. Streeter, whom we have long known as a happy relator of "anecdotal truths." There is, indeed, something which all people ought seriously to ponder in the idea of preaching a doctrine for which no good man could be induced to pray. Universalists are the only consistent christians on this point, their Faith and their Prayers can always correspond, and go harmoniously hand in hand.

## ORIGINAL ANECDOTE.

As Br. R. B.—t, of H—n, N. H. was going to the place of his appointment for preaching, not long since, he came up with a gentleman, who had the appearance of a preacher. Of course, our very companionable and facetious brother B. must have a short discourse with his fellow traveler.—Hence, after the usual salutation, where people thus accidentally fall in company, an interesting conversation followed, of which this is a pretty fair report. It may serve as a mirror for others. (B.) I conclude from your appearance, Sir, that you are a Clergyman.—"I am," was the reply. Well Sir, with your leave, I wish to ask you a few civil questions, and then make a proposition or two for your consideration.—"Proceed," said the Clergyman, "with as many questions as you please."—(B.) Do you, Sir, believe and preach the doctrine of endless misery for a part of the human family?—(C.) "I do." (B.) And how much salary do you have for preaching what you sincerely believe?—(C.) "Why, Sir, I have a small salary; only about four hundred dollars a year, or eight dollars a sabbath." (B.) Indeed, only eight dollars per sabbath. Well, Sir, I will now make you a fair and generous offer. If you will name the Sabbath, that I may be present and hear you, when you will pray openly and plainly, four times during the day that your doctrine may be true,—that is, that a part of your congregation, and of mankind in general, may be, damned to all eternity, I will give you eight dollars more, for your extra services, and that will make you a pretty fat salary, for one day, at least. And lest you should suppose I mean to take some advantage of your compliance with my proposition, I will engage, in the most serious manner, not to say a word about it, to any mortal on earth. I have no mischievous intentions, but simply wish to hear you pray for the truth of your doctrine, before the same people who pay you for preaching it.

But the Rev. gentleman absolutely refused to accept Br. B.'s fair and generous offer. He would not pray for the truth of the very doctrine which he preached, even if his wages could be doubled! Hence he was very feelingly reminded of the gross impropriety of his conduct, and of the great difference of situation between him and the advocate for impartial grace and truth.—I, (said Br. B.) can pray earnestly for the truth of the doctrine which I preach; while you, dear Sir, preach a doctrine, for eight dollars a Sabbath, for which you will not offer up prayers for the same amount. Do, I entreat you, friend and brother, think on this subject, and act with more consistency.

R. S.

## MORE LABORERS.

The Trumpet mentions that Br. Henry Bacon of Boston, a young gentleman of good character and talents, has lately entered the ministry of Reconciliation. He preached for the first time in Quincy, Mass. a week ago last Sunday. The Religious Inquirer gives information, that Br. Alvan Gates of Hartford, N. Y. has commenced preaching the Gospel. He formerly belonged to the Baptist Church, and was baptized by Elder Amasa Brown, the same who administered the ordinance to Rev. Hosea Ballou and Rev. David Cropper. We care not how many more Elder Brown baptises, as long as he supplies our ministry with such men as these.

## NEW PUBLICATION.

We acknowledge the receipt of a printed sermon delivered in Gloucester, Mass. in April last by Br. Elbridge Trull of Frances-town, N. H. entitled "The tower of Babel, or the imaginary safe side." As its title imports, the discourse relates to the erection of the tower of Babel—to the motives which prompted its erection, the manner in which the work was carried on and the confusion which followed in the language of the builders. The whole is applied to the machinations of modern orthodoxy, whereby its disciples calculate on two chances for salvation by building a tower of their own righteousness on which to ascend to heaven, in case the Almighty should prove false to his promise, the only chance on which Universalists rely. The application of this subject we believe was original with Mr. Ballou, and we have seen it employed several times since by other writers. There is an ingenuity about it, which strikes us as its chief merit.

## NEW MEETING HOUSES.

Several Universalist Meeting houses are being built in South Carolina—particularly in Newberry and Anderson Districts. We rejoice to witness the spread of truth in that region. Br. Allen Fuller is about the only Gospel preacher now in South Carolina. The prospect of a reinforcement in the Autumn is encouraging. Rev. G. C. Leach of Taunton, Mass. has already commenced a tour to the Carolinas, and Rev. M. Rayner, Z. Thompson and J. B. Dods are to go out on the setting in of cold weather here.

## NEW SOCIETY.

A Society of believers in the Gospel was organized in Montgomery, Alabama, on the 22d June last—under the name of "The First Unitarian Universalist Society of Montgomery." Br. L. F. W. Andrews is located with this Society, and publishes a paper called The Southern Evangelist.

## Y. C. & O. ASSOCIATION.

This Universalist Association will hold its annual session in Turner next Wednesday and Thursday. We expect a large gathering of the people on that occasion.

## CONFERENCE.

A conference of Universalist Clergymen was to have been held on Wednesday last in Saccarappa.

Reader,—have you perused the Letter of Dr. Ely to Br. Thomas on our first page? if not, stop just where you are and turn back, and give it a careful and candid reading. Then return to this place again and see below how a simple stone from the sling of Br. T. brings all the Goliath like argument of the Dr. to the ground. Never—never—did a man fall into more faithful hands than did Dr. E. when he fell into the hands of Br. Thomas. We regard this controversy as the most interesting and useful of any on religious subjects which we have ever seen. When finished, we trust it will be published in a volume and put into every family in the country.

☞ We would greatly thank Br. Price if he would send us two copies, hereafter, of those numbers of the Messenger containing the Controversy—one directed to Gardiner, for the benefit of the printers, in addition to that now forwarded to the Editor in Augusta. Will he thus oblige us? Doubtless.

## To Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely.—Letter 9.

Philadelphia, August 2, 1834.

Dear Sir—Your remarks and inquiries concerning the influence and tendency of Universalism would be very proper, were they relevant to the question in debate. But they are not—for our present inquiry is simply, Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the Bible? or does the Bible teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? I am utterly indisposed to countenance the introduction of matters foreign to the point at issue. So soon as our present question is finally disposed of, I will be ready and willing to meet you in discussion of the influence and tendency of our sentiments respectively, should you feel disposed to engage in such discussion.

Lest, however, your remarks should make an unfavorable impression on the minds of some of our readers, I will so far gratify you as to say, distinctly, that, in my judgment, the practical utility of any doctrine is the strongest presumptive evidence that can be given of its truth; that a demoralizing doctrine should neither be believed nor taught; that I believe Universalism to be the doctrine of God, who revealed it and commanded it to be preached to all nations for the obedience of faith; that I prize it for its moralizing tendency and comforting influence; and that I know it has been instrumental in converting the drunkard, the profane swearer, the profligate, and other vile persons, from the error of their ways. I farther certify you, that I solemnly believe such conversions to be the legitimate effects of the doctrine of Universalism. Moreover, I feel much satisfaction in being enabled to testify, that the societies of Universalists in this city and elsewhere, can be, and are hereby "declared to be equal in point of sobriety, industry and good general moral character," to any societies in which the doctrine of endless punishment is inculcated. I say, equal—and will add, if they are not better, better men, women, parents, children, neighbors, citizens, they do not come up to the standard of the faith.

On the other hand, I sincerely believe that the doctrine of endless punishment is exceedingly baleful in its influence—dishon-

orable to God—injurious to mankind, and detrimental to human enjoyment. I believe its natural tendency to be, to corrupt and circumscribe the operations of that love which is greater than faith or hope—to foster spiritual pride and self-righteousness—to make sad the hearts of the righteous whom the testimony of Jesus will not make sad—and to strengthen the hands of the wicked, by putting afar the day of evil, and by promising him an escape from the just demerit of his iniquities. I believe that all the persecutions, which have filled the world with blood, and groans, and tears, originated in the principles of Partialism. In a word, I am fully persuaded that the doctrine of endless punishment stands directly opposed to the nature, perfections will and promise of God—that it is at war with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ—that it composes no part of Divine Revelation—that it is repugnant to right reason and to all the holiest aspirations of the human heart—and that its natural tendency is to evil in all its Protean forms. I say these things, not by way of retaliation, but because I am solemnly and sincerely convinced of their truth.

You ask me what good can be derived to any one from Universalism, even if it is true. You seem to think that as all men will eventually be saved, (according to this doctrine,) it matters not what evils they may suffer in the present life!! Besure, you use other language—but such is the substance of your remarks. Allow me to ask you, why any one should desire to be cured of a painful disease, seeing that his body will suffer no pain in the grave?—Why should a blind man wish to see, a deaf man to hear, a dumb man to speak, or a lame man to walk, each being fully satisfied that his malady can afflict him only in the present life? You possess too much discernment to overlook the bearing, and too much candor to deny the force of these queries. You speak of salvation as a matter wholly pertaining to the immortal state of being. In this you err. Allow me to assure you, that Universalism, is "the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth," and to no other persons—for "he that believeth not shall be damned"—and "this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light."

There is one other part of your irrelevant observations which I desire to notice. You speak of Universalist periodical publications as being "almost exclusively devoted to one object—that of convincing all men, that however they may live and die, they shall all be infallibly holy and happy in an immortal future state of being." Why did you not add, for the information of your readers, that though "the restitution of all things, which God had spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," is the prominent and leading doctrine of our papers, other and correlative subjects engage our earnest and constant attention? You, sir, have not perused our written labors to so little profit, as to be ignorant of the fact, that we incessantly urge the utility of, and the necessity for, "repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." We "affirm constantly, that they who have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works," for "these things are good and profitable unto men." We hold that "the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared—teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly in the present world"—for he alone can be truly happy, who is a practical disciple of "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."

I have thus noticed many of your remarks, which obviously do not belong to the point at issue; and I beg leave to repeat, that I will not consent to discuss these matters in detail until our present question shall have been finally disposed of. You will not dispute the propriety of this determination.

Your argument on Matt. xxiv. et seq. is substantially the same as presented in previous letters. You have neglected to notice my reasoning on many points connected with the coming of the Son of Man. I therefore propose to bring the subject more fully into view. Its importance is obvious—for, having admitted that a part of the chapter refers to events which transpired at the destruction of Jerusalem, and believing that the remainder refers to the immortal state of being, you found it necessary to point out the verse at which you suppose the transition of reference to take place. You selected verse 36. You could not have chosen any other—for the preceding context shut you out entirely; and you clearly perceived that the adverbs of time in Matt. xxv. required you either to stop at verse 36 of Matt. xxiv. or to allow that neither of the chapters furnishes any proof of the point you desire to establish. This, then, is a plain statement of the case. Let us proceed to the argument.

1st. You say, the disciples "proposed an inquiry concerning the end of the world, as distinct from the time of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem." In reply, I remark, 1st. I have several times desired you to notice the fact, that the word translated world in the phrase "end of the world," is not kosmos, the material world, but aion, the age. Therefore, the assertion that the disciples "supposed the [material] world was to come to an end" at the coming of the Son of Man is groundless, and your argument is lost.—2d. In verses 6, 13, 14 of Matt. xxiv, "the end" is distinctly spoken of in immediate connexion with the signs that should precede the destruction of Jerusalem. "Ye shall hear of wars . . . but the end [what end?] is not yet . . . There shall be famines and pestilences . . . all these are the beginning of sorrows, [what sorrows?] Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted. . . but he that shall endure unto the end, [what end?] the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations [see Matt. xxv. 32, in which it is declared that all nations should be gathered before the Son of Man,] and then shall the end come. When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet . . . then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the house top not come down to take any thing out of his house, etc. Who can avoid perceiving that all these things, including the end spoken of, were to trans-

pire at the destruction of Jerusalem? But 3d. the disciples asked only two questions: "When shall these things be?" viz. the destruction of the Temple; and "what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" thus inquiring for the sign of the simultaneous events. It was "IMMEDIATELY" the tribulation of those days, viz. the destruction of Jerusalem, that "THE SIGN OF THE SON OF MAN" was to appear in heaven, verse 30, and then the Son of Man would be seen coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. That was also the sign of the end of the world under the law. Then the old covenant was to be abolished, and the reign of Christ in the kingdom which the Father had appointed him, was then to commence.

2d. You offer some remarks on the word "generation," but the state of the case is not altered thereby—for you have admitted that all the persons "then living did not pass to their graves before Jerusalem was destroyed;" and you have conceded that the 35th verse inclusive, the language of Jesus referred to that destruction, and not to any thing yet future. I desire you to remember, that you do not suppose any transition of reference until you reach the 35th verse of the chapter. At that point your argument commences; and you seem to think that the disjunctive conjunction "but," settles the question as to said transition. "But of that day" what day? Plainly, the day of which our Savior had so particularly spoken in the preceding verses.

3d. You say in answer to a remark of mine, that Jesus did "acknowledge his inability to inform his disciples" of the precise day and hour of his coming. You quote McKnight, and call him my favorite. The object of so doing is obvious. But allow me to say, that the author you mention is your own favorite, and not mine. I believe I have not once quoted him in this controversy—I have quoted Dr. Campbell against him. But this is a matter of small importance. Campbell, Wakefield, Newcome, Clarke, and a host of others, stand opposed to McKnight on the passage in question. I believe the received version gives a correct rendering of the original.—The entire context discountenances any other rendering. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." The parallel in Mark xiii, 32, is still more emphatic. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, not the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." It would have been foolishness to have said, no man, maketh known that day, for no man knew it was to be—and how could any one make known to others what he did not know himself?

4th. You say, "I do not admit that Matt. xxiv. 36—41 and Luke xvii, 20—37 are parallel passages." You are aware that to admit the parallel would be to destroy your whole argument drawn from Matt. xxiv. and xxv. You admit the similarity of language, and the only reason you assign for denying the parallelism, is, that in the one case Jesus was addressing his disciples, and in the other the Pharisees! I cannot think you are satisfied with this reason. But allowing that you are, I must inform you that Jesus was addressing his disciples, in both cases. See Luke xvii, 22. "And he said unto his disciples, The days will come," &c. The consequence is that your argument is lost.

5th. You say, "many have been led to conclude that Christ's prophecy concerning his coming must have a double meaning and a two-fold accomplishment." But will you, sir, pretend that such a conclusion is correct? Will you risk your reputation as a Biblical expositor, by contending for said double meaning? In another part of your letter you pronounce certain principles of interpretation erroneous, because, in your judgment, they would "render the Bible an uncertain, unmeaning Rule of faith." Are you sure that this would not be consequent of admitting a double meaning in Christ's prophecy concerning his coming?

I may add, while on this point, that Whitby, Pearce, Hammond, Kenrick, Clarke, and others, acknowledge the parallel which you deny. I might furnish many interesting extracts from their notes, but must be content with the following from Whitby, on Matt. xxiv, 40, 41: "That it relates not to the final judgment, but to the time of the destruction of the Jews by the Roman army, is evident from the same words recorded in Luke xvii, 35, 36."

As your entire argument drawn from Matt. xxiv, xxv, rests on the supposition that verse 36 of chap. xxiv, commences the reference to events which are yet future, I desire your particular attention to the proof of that supposition.

Your quotation of Heb. ix, 27, 28, will be of no service to your argument, unless you can show, 1st. That natural death is significant in the expression, "And as it is appointed unto (tois anthropois) THE MEN once to die, (see preceding verses, and Heb. vii, 28;) and 2d. That the second appearance of Christ, spoken of in verse 28, refers to any other than the present world.

I agree with you that it would be "needless and trifling to attempt to show that everlasting life means everlasting life." Everlasting life is simply the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, John. xvii, 3. The believer enjoys it in the present life, as you admit. But I desire you to prove, if you can, that the blessedness of the immortal state depends, in any sense, on the faith of the believer. Neither the belief nor unbelief of man can effect the promise and purpose of God. Paul testifies that "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father;" and this great consummation of the reign of Jesus cannot be thwarted by the present unbelief of any part of mankind.

You deny that akatalutos, endless, is a stronger term than aionios, everlasting—and you affirm that the latter is stronger than the former, because "Jesus is said to be made a priest after the power of an endless life, zoes akatalutos, that is, a priest forever, and he testified, thou art a priest forever, the ton aiona." A few remarks will show the fallacy of your reasoning. 1st. The priesthood of Aaron was aionios everlasting—hood of Aaron was aionios everlasting—but you will not pretend that it was endless, the indissoluble. 2d. The priesthood under the law was "after the order of Melchizedek," for ever, after the order of Melchizedek. 3d. The Aaronic was a changeable priesthood inasmuch as the priests "were not



In Norridgewock 24th ult. Jason Hinds, Esq. Jail  
or, aged 35.

In this town, Mrs Hannah Berry, aged 25.  
In Troy, Aug. 1st, Lewis B. youngest son of Capt  
Israel Ungley aged 4.  
In Dixmont, Mrs Mary Bradley, aged 28.  
In Camlen, Mr Jason Venzie, aged 21.  
In Belfast, Mr Lewis Bean, aged 55.  
In Norridgewock 24th ult. Jason Hinds, Esq. Jail  
or, aged 35.



